

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant :	Shunpei YAMAZAKI et al.	Art Unit :	2642
Serial No. :	09/811,837	Examiner :	Jack Chiang
Filed :	March 20, 2001	Confirmation No.:	8400
Title :	ELECTRONIC DEVICE		

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REPLY TO ACTION OF OCTOBER 13, 2005

Claims 1, 2, 10, 11, 20-22, 31, 39, 47, 66, 74, 75, 84, 92, 93, 102, 103 and 105-121 are pending. Claims 10, 11, 20-22, 31, 39, 47, 66, 74, 75, 84, 92, 93, 102, 103 and 105-121 have been withdrawn, leaving claims 1 and 2 under consideration.

Claims 1 and 2 are again rejected as being unpatentable over Danielson (WO 94/19736) in view of Jacobsen (U.S. Patent No. 6,232,937). Applicant again requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because neither Danielson, Jacobsen, nor any proper combination of the two describes or suggests operation keys that each comprise LEDs and that display images switchable between a first orientation and a second orientation.

The prior rejection had argued that Danielson, in Figs. 2 and 3, shows that the direction of an image displayed by a touch sensitive display 15, and the indicia provided by a template 43 that surrounds operation keys 16, are switchable between first and second orientations. Acknowledging that Danielson does not show that the operation keys 16 have LEDs, the rejection then argued that Jacobsen shows that an image may be displayed in different orientations by an LED matrix. From this, the rejection argued that the combination of Danielson and Jacobsen would somehow result in the operation keys 16 having LEDs that display images switchable between first and second orientations.

As previously noted, applicant disagrees with this position. Initially, as neither Danielson nor Jacobsen appears to show including LEDs in the operation keys, it is not understood how such inclusion would result from the combination of Danielson and Jacobsen. In particular,

nothing in Danielson or Jacobsen would have led one of ordinary skill in the art to include LEDs in Danielson's operation keys 16.

Moreover, though Danielson shows switching the orientation of the keys 16 from a first direction to a second direction by changing an orientation of a template 43 that surrounds the keys, this in no way describes or suggests switching the orientation of an image displayed by the keys. Nor does Danielson's description of a touch sensitive display describe or suggest changing the orientation of images displayed by operation keys, such as Danielson's keys 16.

In addition, if one were to replace Danielson's LCD display 15 with Jacobsen's LED matrix, this would have no impact on Danielson's operation keys 16. In particular, it would not result in the keys including LEDs that display images that may be displayed in different orientations. Nor could the resulting LED matrix be said to include the recited operation keys.

Finally, if one were to replace Danielson's template 42 with Jacobsen's LED matrix, this still would not result in LEDs being included in the operation keys, as recited in claim 1. Rather, it would result in the operation keys being surrounded by LEDs.

Apparently recognizing the merits of applicant's position, and in response to applicant's arguments, the Examiner now asserts that the recited operation keys also may correspond to the keys displayed on Danielson's touch sensitive LCD display 15. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this conclusion. In particular, Danielson's *LCD* display cannot be said to correspond to a display portion and a collection of operation keys having *LEDs*.

First, if the keys displayed on Danielson's LCD display could be said to correspond to the recited operation key, then there would be no other component of Danielson's system that could be said to correspond to the recited display portion.

In addition, in the restriction requirement dated February 13, 2004, the Examiner asserted that species 2, which was directed to "keys having LCD," was patentably distinct from species 1, which was directed to "keys having LED." Since species 1 was elected, the Examiner cannot now assert that components of Danielson's *LCD* display can in any way correspond to the recited operation keys comprising *LEDs*.

Also, it appears that Jacobsen's LED is part of a back light for a display such as a LCD display (col. 2, lines 50-58). As the Examiner indicated, the back light system is disclosed by Jacobsen at col. 15, lines 38-60 and Figs. 5e and 5g. Therefore, if Jacobsen's LED were to be incorporated into Danielson's system, at best, it would be applied to a back light of Danielson's LCD screen 15, and, if so, a combination of Danielson and Jacobsen does not include operation keys comprising LEDs, as recited in claim 1.

For at least these reasons, the rejection of claims 1 and 2 should be withdrawn.


Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

The fee in the amount of \$120 for the One-Month Extension of Time is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

2/13/06


John F. Hayden
Reg. No. 37,640

Customer No. 26171
Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W. - 11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331
/adt
40324331.doc